

near-synonyms at line-end is common and unexceptional; among many instances from tragedy may be cited E. *Alc.* 1105 ἄθρει BOV: ὄρα LPQ; *Tr.* 271 πόνων V: κακῶν PQ; *Ba.* 227 στέγαις L: δόμοις P; A. *Th.* 652 π[ά]τραν P.Oxy.: πόλιν codd.; *Pr.* 20 πάγω] τόπω M; S. *Ant.* 449 νόμους] ὄρους S; *Ph.* 331 θανεῖν] παθεῖν K; 560 ἔχεις] φέρεις GR, Q^{sl}.⁶ But it is by no means unusual for one disyllable to supplant another at line-end even when there is no apparent connection in meaning between the two words; cf., e.g., E. *Alc.* 520 ἔτι BOV: πέρι LP; 1089 λέχος BOV: μόνος LPQ; A. *Th.* 191 φυγὰς] βοὰς OYa, B^{sl}; *Pr.* 75 πόνω] χρόνω HaOYa; S. *Tr.* 731 λόγον L^{no}: χρόνον codd.; *Aj.* 1130 νόμους LQ: γένος GR, F^{no}. The possibility that the variants δόμον and φόβον in *Med.* 487 simply represent another instance of the phenomenon outlined above is raised to a virtual certainty by the fact that δόμους (recte) and φόβους occur as variants in E. *Su.* 225 (though not at line-end).⁷

Memorial University of Newfoundland

MARK JOYAL

⁶ For further examples from Euripides, see Bond, op. cit. (n. 5), p. 190 n. 2; and for some comments on the substitution of synonyms in the text of Euripides, see Zuntz, op. cit. (n. 1), pp. 265–7.

⁷ My thanks to the journal's anonymous referee for generous advice in the writing of this note; and to Professor Martin Cropp for supplying valuable bibliographical assistance.

NOTES ON THE PARODOS-SCENE IN EURIPIDES' HERACLIDAE, 73–117¹

In response to Iolaus' cry for help, the chorus in *Hclid.* enter at a run (βοηδρομούντες, cf. 121), and the Parodos takes a form appropriate to that. Instead of choral song-and-dance, what follows, after an exceptionally brief non-strophic 'entry'-passage, is an amoibaion first between the Chorus-leader and Iolaus, then between the Chorus-leader and the Herald, musical only as featuring some 'half-chanted' sequences in the Chorus-leader's utterances.

73–7. The 'entry':

ΧΟΡΟΣ

ἔα ἔα· τίς ἢ βοῇ βωμοῦ πέλας
ἔστηκε; ποῖαν κυφορὰν δείξει τάχα;
ἴδετε τὸν γέροντ' ἀμαλὸν ἐπὶ πέδωι χύμενον· ὦ τάλας,
πρὸς τοῦ ποτ' ἐν γῇ πτώμα δύεττον πίτνεις; 75–6

73–4 and 77, as iambic trimeters with Attic vocalization, are presumably spoken by the Chorus-leader. 73–4 might indeed be interpreted as

ἔα ἔα· – τίς ἢ βοῇ βωμοῦ πέλας
ἔστηκε; – ποῖαν κυφορὰν δείξει τάχα;

and thereafter there might be speaker-changes before ἴδετε and before and/or after ὦ τάλας; but nothing in the pattern of the verses favours such fragmentation. Dochmiacs can combine with spoken iambs in the same sentence;² and the continuity at 76–7 is like *Hipp.* 818f. ... ὦ τύχα, | ὥς μοι βαρεῖα καὶ δόμοις ἐπεστάθης.

¹ I am grateful to Dr J. Diggle for encouragement and helpful comments; also to the CQ referee who drew attention to some errors and inadequacies in the first draft submitted.

² Cf. especially *Hipp.* 817–51; also *Med.* 1286–9, *Hec.* 1030–4, *Or.* 1353–60.

The three-dochmiac *τίχος* here, with its many short syllables, well expresses a burst of exclamatory emotion, followed by calmer utterance.³

Diggle, after Murray, marks a lacuna of one iambic trimeter between 76 and 77, though nothing in the sense suggests that anything is missing at this point; nor, alternatively, between the question in 77 and the answer to it in 78–9, as Seidler had opined. The lacuna is postulated solely in accordance with Seidler's determination of 'strophe' and 'antistrophe' as beginning at 75 and 95 respectively. In following Murray, Diggle surprisingly accepts the anomaly of 95–8 being divided between *Χορός* and *Κήρυξ*, whereas 75–7 has no corresponding speaker-change. This runs counter to the rule of 'symmetry of speakers', in general recognised by Diggle, and most unlikely to have been breached in the first strophic pair.⁴

There is no reason, *a priori*, to expect the beginning of a strophe at 75. Why not rather (if the scene is strophic, which it need not be) at 73, given that the corresponding passages are to include trimeters as well as dochmiacs? And is it not odd *prima facie* to begin an antistrophe at 95, in the middle of the exchanges between Iolaus and the Chorus-leader, rather than at 99 (see below), where the Herald steps in and replaces Iolaus in the dialogue?

78–117. The dialogue between Iolaus and the Chorus-leader (78–98) has the pattern **a – b¹ – a – c – a – b² – a – c – a** (**a** = two trimeters); that between the Herald and the Chorus-leader (99–119) begins **a – b¹ – a – c – a**... (continuing with trimeters only). *Prima facie*, if we are looking for strophe and antistrophe, this is the place at which to begin our search.

The shorter *XO.* utterances (**c**) are straightforward *τίχοι* (printable *uno versu*) of three dochmiacs, like 75–6 above, but now self-contained:

- 86–7 ὄνομα τί σε, γέρον, Μυκηναῖος ὠνόμαζεν λεώς;
95–6 τί χρέος; ἡ λόγων πόλεος, ἔνεπέ μοι, μελόμενοι τυχεῖν;
107–8 ἄθεον ἱκεσίαν μεθεῖναι πόλει ξένων προστροπᾶν (see below).

It may be observed that 107–8 has syllabic correspondence with 86–7, and 95–6 with 75–6. That might be fortuitous, but see further below.

The other *XO.* utterances (**b¹**, **b²**) are iambo-dochmiac, with a shift (clear-cut at least in 80–3 and 101–4) from speech to 'chant' with Doric vocalisation:

- | | | |
|-------|---|------------------------|
| 80–3 | <p> $\kappa\upsilon\delta'$ ἐκ τίνος γῆς, ὦ γέρον, τετράπολιν
 ξύνοικον ἤλθες λαόν; ἡ πέραθεν ἀλίῳ πλάται
 κατέχετ' ἐκλιπόντες Εὐβοῖδ' ἀκτάν;⁵ </p> | <p>trimeter
28</p> |
| 90–2 | <p> οἷδ' εἰσακούσας καὶ πρὶν ἄλλὰ τοῦ ποτ' ἐν χειρὶ καὶ
 κομίζεις κόρους νεοτρεφεῖς, φράσων.⁶ </p> | <p>28</p> |
| 101–4 | <p> εἰκὸς θεῶν ἱκτῆρας αἰδεῖσθαι, ξένε,
 καὶ μὴ βιαίῳ χειρὶ δαιμόνων ἀπολιπεῖν <cf> ἔδη
 πότνια γὰρ Δίκα τὰδ' οὐ πείσεται. </p> | <p>trimeter
28</p> |

³ 3δ is a common length, which need not be divided (arbitrarily) as 2δ | δ or δ | 2δ or δ | δ | δ. For the expressive effect of the shift from dochmiacs to speech, cf. Barrett on *Hipp.* 817–51; note that in all these mixed passages (last n.) resolution is eschewed in the contrasting iambic trimeters.

⁴ A few exceptions to the rule have been claimed; see Collard, *Supplices* ii.392–5, and my commentary on *Orestes*, p. 105. But it remains a rule.

⁵ ἡ (cf. 95), not ἦ: 'or have you crossed the sea from Euboea' is plainly illogical after 'from what γῆ have you come to this πόλις?' Euboea is a γῆ.

⁶ In 92 a comma (not a question-mark) before φράσων unifies the syntax.

90–2 (**b**²) as transmitted is virtually identical in metre with 81–3 and 102–4 (i.e. **b**² = **b**¹ without the initial trimeter); note that all three have the word-pattern $\underline{\text{v}}-\underline{\text{v}}-\underline{\text{v}};-\underline{\text{v}};-\dots$. Diggle obscures the identity by dividing 90–2 as trimeter||*ia* δ||δ, mistakenly accepting Elmsley's $\tau\omicron\upsilon\ \pi\omicron\tau\epsilon\ |\ \acute{\epsilon}\nu$ for L's $\tau\omicron\upsilon\ |\ \pi\omicron\tau\ \acute{\epsilon}\nu$. The hiatus thus created, with *brevis in longo*, is unwelcome, to say the least;¹¹ and the verse *ia* δ (unlike *cr* δ, *ba* δ, *2ia* δ, $\wedge 2ia$ δ) is another rarity in Euripides, scarcely to be introduced against the tradition, especially in the middle of a sentence.¹²

<i>ΚΗ.</i>	ἐκπεμπέ νυν γῆς τούδε (οἱ τῆςδε) τοὺς Εὐρυςθέως,	105
	κοῦδεν βιαίῳ τῆδε χρήσομαι χερί.	
<i>ΧΘ.</i>	ἄθεον ἱκεσίαν μεθεΐναι πόλει (σ.ν.λ.) ξέων προτροπᾶν.	
<i>ΚΗ.</i>	καλὸν δέ γ' ἔξω πραγμάτων ἔχει πάδα,	
	εὐβουλίας τυχόντα τῆς ἀμείνονος.	110
<i>ΧΘ.</i>	οὐκοῦν τυράννῳ τῆςδε γῆς φράσαντά σε	
	χρῆν ταῦτα τολμᾶν, ἀλλὰ μὴ βίαι ξένους	
	θεῶν ἀφέλκειν, γῆν céβοντ' ἑλευθέραν;	

⁷ For the usual view, see Stinton, *CR* 15 (1965), 145, who compared especially the verse
 ὁ δὲ θεὸς ἔπειτα καὶ τὸν ἄνθρωπον ἐκείνους ἡμέρας ἔπειτα καὶ τὸν ἄνθρωπον ἐκείνους ἡμέρας
 at S. *O.T.* 1339/1359. Diggle in his *Studies on the Text of Euripides* (1981),
 pp. 18ff., justifies the 'resolution before syncope' in his treatment as *3ia cr.*, but does not
 comment on his abnormal iambic dimeter with 'word-end after long second anceps' (L. P. E.
 Parker, *CQ* 16 (1966), 14ff.); for this too, as it happens, one of the few parallels is at S. *O.T.*
 1336/1356.

¹² For the data, see N. C. Conomis, *Hermes* 92 (1962), 47–8, supplemented by Diggle, *CQ* 40 (1990), 107–8. *ia* δ is frequent in Aeschylus. *Aj.* 296–7/414–15 (early in date) is the only Sophoclean instance. Apart from our passage, the instances claimed for Euripides are: *Alc.* 873/890 (*ΑΔ. αἰαί ΧΟ. ~~~~~*; this is *2ia* *cr* if *αἰαί* is intra-metric); *Hipp.* 866 *φεῦ φεῦ, τὸδ' αὖ νεοχμὸν ἐκδοχαῖς* (*φεῦ φεῦ* could be extra-metric); in *ibid.* 594 *αἰαί εἰ εἰ* s.v.l. is likely to be *~~~~*); *Hec.* 1092 *βοᾶν βοᾶν αὐτῷ βοᾶν* (possibly dittographic, or a conflation of β-ᾶ-β- and β-β-ᾶ-); *Tro.* 247–8 *τοῦμόν τίς ᾄρ' | ἔλαχε τέκος, ἔνεπε, τλάμονα Κασσάνδραν*; (fort. *τοῦμόν* *<ἔλαχε>* κτλ.); *Hel.* 648 *φίλαι φίλαι, | τὰ πάρος οὐκέτι...* (most treat *φίλαι* *bis* as a separate short verse); *ibid.* 661 and 662 *εἰ εἰ ~~~~~*, similar to *Hyps.* 64.72 *αἰαί φυνγὰς ἐμέθεν ᾗς ἐφνυγον* (see *CQ* 39 [1989], 62); *Hyps.* 64.99 (dub., see *CQ* 39 [1989], 60); *Ba.* 1031 *ὦναξ Βρόμει, θεὸς φαίνῃ μέγας* (probably defective, see Dodds). The evidence suggests that *ia* δ (with a single *ia*) was either eschewed by Euripides or used only at the *beginning* of an utterance; and it may well be significant that most of the above passages are exclamatory.

to Eurystheus out of the land', and there will then be no need for violence on his own part. The Chorus-leader replies that piety forbids (such) dismissal/disregard of a supplicatory appeal from ξένοι. As things stand, he says that it is impious for a (or the) city to behave thus; but Elmsley was right to question that. (i) In 109–10 the Herald retorts to a γνώμη with a γνώμη which inferentially commands a different course of action. The retort is more accurate if there is no change in the subject of the infinitives;¹³ but 110 is concerned with conduct proper for a person, as is shown by the participle τυχόντα (not τυχοῦσαν). (ii) The logic of the situation is that it is for the city to decide whether to accept or reject these ξένοι, given that they have appealed to the city (94). The Chorus-leader should not pre-empt that decision by saying what it is ἄθεον for the city to do.¹⁴ It is easy, as Elmsley proposed, to write πέλει for πόλει (the same error as at *Phaethon* 126 Diggle). For πέλει as copula in a gnomic observation, cf. also *Phaethon* 87, *S. Ant.* 833, and *A. Eum.* 233 (in a similar sentiment).¹⁵

Following this exchange it is timely for the Chorus-leader to introduce the theme of what the Herald ought to have done. It is hard to visualise the content of a further meaningful exchange (*a fortiori* exchanges) before that, and οὐκουν... is logically appropriate: *sc.* 'If, as you say, it is καλόν to steer clear of trouble and to behave εὐβούλως, would it not have been proper for you to ...?'

There is thus no case for marking a lacuna here either, on grounds of sense. But what now of the strophic argument? Is 'expectation of responsion' so strong as to require us, despite the satisfactory continuity of sense, to postulate the loss of a passage after 110 corresponding with 90–8? It would be wrong to deny the possibility of such a line-loss; but the burden of proof is upon those who still wish to print the text itself with the defacement of a lacuna, rather than contenting themselves with (at most) a note of suspicion in their apparatus criticus. Apart from continuity of sense, there are several considerations here favouring the integrity of the text, with strophe and antistrophe now determined as 78–89 ~ 99–110.

(i) Strophe and antistrophe do not have to run consecutively; there may be intervening verses of any number from two (*El.* 125–6) to nearly three hundred (*Hipp.* 373–668); and there are no determinable rules governing their structure.¹⁶

(ii) In particular there is nothing wrong with the sequence: non-strophic choral entry – strophe – non-strophic utterances – antistrophe – further non-strophic utterances. Indeed, in exhibiting that structure, our scene follows the precedent of both *Alcestis* (77–111) and *Medea* (131–210), though of course it is quite different in other features. Note that *Alc.* 105–11 balances 93–7, but these passages (at least partly non-lyrical) cannot be brought into the same precise responsion as *Alc.* 86–92 ~ 98–104.¹⁷

¹³ Cf. *Or.* 486–7 ME. Ἑλληνικόν τοι τὸν ὁμόθεν τιμᾶν αἰεί. | ΤΥ. καὶ τῶν νόμων γε μὴ πρότερον εἶναι θέλειν.

¹⁴ πόλει ξένων προστροπᾶν cannot of course be 'an appeal of ξένοι to the city'; προστρέπειν is transitive, so that an 'appeal to the city' can only be πόλεως προστροπή, as at *S. OC* 558.

¹⁵ Elmsley rightly favoured πέλει more than his alternatives πάλιν or τι. The correction may be 'unnecessary'; but we should be concerned rather with its chances of being right. If πόλει and πέλει had been transmitted as variants, there can be little doubt which would have been preferred by thoughtful editors.

¹⁶ There is no need to strain language by calling 90–8 a 'mesode' (like *El.* 125–6, 150–6). We can properly (if we wish) extend the use of that term so as to include passages of sung dialogue separating strophe from antistrophe, such as *Hec.* 177–86 (or 170–86); but not to partly spoken passages.

¹⁷ Diggle's text rightly shows *Alc.* 93–7 and 105–11 as balancing passages, separated by line-spaces from the preceding strophe and antistrophe. He leaves the strophic issue open in his apparatus; but the chances are that 'balance', rather than 'responsion', is the right

Similarly in our scene 111–17 (the conclusion of the dialogue between Chorus-leader and Herald) can properly be said to balance 90–8 (the conclusion of the dialogue between Chorus-leader and Iolaus) without being in strophic responsion (see also (v) below). Both 90–8 and 111–17 comprise four utterances and (in my lineation) seven verses, and the mathematics of this are unlikely to be fortuitous.

(iii) 78–98 is abnormally long for a strophe in a partly spoken amoibaion. In such contexts Euripides favoured symmetry between much shorter divided sequences (cf. *Alc.* 244–65, *Hipp.* 571–90, *Andr.* 825–40), when the amoibaion is not wholly atrophic (as in *Hec.* 683–720, *Tro.* 239–77, etc.).

(iv) There are two particular features in 90–8 which tend to confirm that the pattern of these lines was not devised with a view to antistrophic repetition after line 110, but simply as an extension of what has gone before. They repeat almost exactly the metrical pattern of the preceding seven verses (in my lineation); and 95–6 exactly repeats the pattern of 75–6 (before the strophe, see above). These metrically retrospective features cannot properly create an expectation of further metrical repetition after 110.

(v) The pattern of our scene is quite intricate, in that $81-9 = 90-8 = 102-10$; but not wholly unlike *Hipp.* $571-6 = 577-83 = 584-90$ (all *XO.*: 5δ | $\Phi A.$: two trimeters), which is followed by a slightly longer exchange completing a balanced sequence.

On one more point of detail, one might well consider correcting *τυράννῳ* in 111 to *τυράννοις*. The plural ('royal authorities') is appropriate here even if Athens has only one *τύραννος* (cf. *βασιλεὺς* 194 in reference to the Argive monarchy); and if Acamas is in fact Demophon's colleague in the kingship, that is another reason for disfavouring the sing. *τυράννῳ* in this sentence.¹⁸

Highgate, London

C. W. WILLINK

interpretation, at least as to 95–7, 108–11 (in 105 I should be inclined to write *καὶ μὰν* (for *μὴν*) *τοῦδε κύριον ἡμᾶρ*, as this is a *lyric* paroemiac like 93 *οὐ τὰν φθιμένας γ' ἐσιώπων* and 91/103). (i) Sound metre and sense can be restored quite easily in 94 and 106–7 by writing *οὐ γὰρ δὴ<που>* (cf. Denniston, *Greek Particles*, p. 268) | *φροῦδος γ' [ἐξ] οἴκων* (or *γε δόμων*, glossed as a slightly abnormal prepositionless genitive) *νέκυς ἦδη* and *–τί τόδ' αὐδάς<εις>*; (Hermann) | *ὦι χρη̃ cφε̃ μολεῖν κατὰ γαῖας*. But symmetry inescapably remains imperfect in the speaker-changes (whether or not we delete the paragraphos at 94) and, less importantly, in the different pattern of the monometer. (ii) The non-lyric anapests in 108–11 are a metron longer than those in 95–7. If that were the only inequality, we should doubtless be happy to follow Kirchoff and others (there are numerous possible supplements). But only rewriting could produce exact responsion between 96–7 and 109–11; and here too there may well be asymmetry of speakers. 109–11 (*χρη̃...πενθεῖν κτλ.*) is better taken, I think, as a straightforward continuation (*sc.* *γάρ*) asyndetically elaborating the statement in 108 (*ἐθίγες ψυχὰς, ἐθίγες δὲ φρένας*).

¹⁸ Twice elsewhere (366, 1055) *βασιλεῦσιν* refers to the Athenian royal house (whether monarchy or diarchy). I have commended Hermann's similar (but more necessary) correction of *τύραννον* to *τυράννοις* at *Med.* 42 in *CQ* 39 (1989), 321.

A NOTE ON WASPS 349

Philocleon, confined to his house by his son Bdelycleon, appeals to the chorus of heliasts, expressing his eagerness to join them as they journey to their courts:

ΦΙ. τίς ἂν οὖν εἶη; ζητεῖθ' ὑμεῖς, ὥς πᾶν ἂν ἔγωγε ποιήην.
οὕτω κιττῶ διὰ τῶν σανίδων μετὰ χοιρίνης περιελθεῖν.
(Aristophanes, *Wasps* 348–9)

Critics have generally associated the *sanides* here mentioned with wooden boards on